



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

wishes to keep the rule with *avoir*, and insists on two reasons for it:

1. The suppression of the rule would result in making archaic, by one fell blow, all poetry written up to the present; only a limited number of cultivated people would be able, after a few years, to enjoy thoroughly verses like these:

Tu négliges mes pleurs, cours et te précipite  
Au devant de la mort que les dieux m'ont prédit E.

The Academy does not feel equal to such sacrifice.

2. The difficulty attributed to the rule is for the most part a prejudice; as a matter of fact it is so simple that children can readily learn it without difficulty.

However the report adds:

"En ce qui concerne les cas où le participe passé est suivi, soit d'un infinitif: *les fruits que je ne suis laissé (ou laissés) prendre; la femme que j'ai entendu (ou entendue) chanter*, ou d'un participe présent ou passé: *les sauvages qu'on a trouvé (ou trouvés) errant (ou errants) dans les forêts*; ou bien dans les cas où le participe passé est précédé d'une expression collective: *la foule d'hommes que j'ai vue (ou vus)*; ou bien encore, dans les cas où le participe est précédé du mot *en* partitif: *des anthropophages, nous en avons vu (ou vus) en Amérique*.

Dans tous les cas, votre commission est disposée à laisser toute liberté aux écrivains."

As may be seen, and as was to be expected, the French Academy has proved conservative. There is hardly anything left of the edict of July; and the little there is actually left, is very half-heartedly approved of.

As the main points specified by the Academy in its report are those I criticized in my article of the December number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, any further mention of them may be dispensed with.

A. SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

# "LEARN" AND "TEACH."

SOME interesting information about the use of the word "learn" for "teach" may be gleaned from a quarrel that arose on this question in the year 1698. In Jeremy Collier's

famous *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage*, published in London that year, he used the following language in ridiculing the diction of Congreve's *Mourning Bride*:—

"But there is no jesting, for the Lady is very bad. She won't be held up by any Means, but Cry out,

. . . lower yet, down, down:

One would think she was learning a Spaniel to *Sett*" (pp. 33, 34).

Congreve published a little book in reply to Collier the same year, 1698, called *Amendments of Mr. Collier's False and Imperfect Citations, &c.* That the passage above had caught his eye, we see from his remarks upon it, as follows:—

"One would think (says Mr. Collier) she was learning a Spaniel to set.

*Learning a Spaniel to set!* *Delectus verborum est Origo eloquentie*, is an Aphorism of *Julius Cæsar*, and Mr. Collier makes it plain. This poor Man does not so much as understand even his own Dog-language, when he says *learning*, I suppose he means *teaching a Spaniel to set*, a dainty Critick, indeed!" (p. 28).

The next step in the controversy appeared in Collier's *Defence of the Short View*, dated 1699, but really published in 1698; he comments on a number of Congreve's strictures, but for some reason makes no particular defense of his own use of the word "learn"; he simply remarks:

"He Cavils at two other little words, which I think may pass: But I shall say nothing in their behalf. To defend such Trifles, would be almost as idle, as to object against them" (p. 91).

But Congreve's expression, "dog-language," had evidently rankled in Collier's mind; for, two pages farther on, he quotes from Congreve, "*The ignoble Curs that Yelp to fill the Cry, And spend their Mouths in barking Tyranny.*" Of this and another expression, he says, "A Common Hunt could not have done it better! This, as Mr. Congreve has it, is *Dog-Language* with a witness."

But although Collier did not care to go more particularly into this question of good usage, another individual in the dramatic controversy took up the cudgels. In this same year, 1698,

there appeared an anonymous little book, called *A Letter to Mr. Congreve on his Pretended Amendments, &c.* On page 20 of this exceedingly bitter attack upon the stage, we find the following:

"You quarrel at Mr. Collier's Phrase of *learning a Spaniel to Set*; which shews, that you are yet to *learn* the compass of our English Tongue, or that you are resolved to be a Wrangling, right or wrong. Say you, *I suppose, he means, teaching a Spaniel to Set.* But why so? What necessity is there for changing the Word, only to put as good a one in the place? For, is Mr. Congreve yet to be told, that *to learn*, is often used Actively, for *to teach*? Does he not remember it to be so used in the *Psalter*? *O learn me true Understanding!* I chuse to refer you to that Ejaculation, because it may be a proper one for you, to use in your Devotions."

The above controversy seems to me an interesting contribution to our knowledge of the history of the word "learn."

WM. LYON PHELPS.

Yale University.

#### GERMANIC GRAMMAR.

*Laut- und Formenlehre der altgermanischen Dialekte. Zweites Buch. Herausgegeben von FERDINAND DIETER. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1900.*

THIS volume, which gives the *Formenlehre*, is a continuation of the *Lautlehre*, which appeared in 1898. The book is the combined work of R. Bethge (Urgerm., Goth., O.N.), F. Dieter (OE.), W. Schlüter (OS.), F. Hartmann (OHG.). In some points it necessarily covers the same ground as Streitberg's *Urgerm. Gram.*, but deals not so much with the relation of the Germ. dialects to other IE. languages as with their relation to each other. It is not intended to supplant the grammars of the various dialects, but to serve as "ergänzung zu den grammatischen einzeldarstellungen":

"Wird er [der studierende] zu jenen greifen, wenn er sich mit dem einen oder dem andern dialekt des näheren vertraut machen will, so mag dieses [lehrbuch] zur erweiterung seines blickes und vertiefung seines verständnisses beitragen, indem es ihm die altgermanischen dialekte als zweige vorführt, die demselben stamm entsprossen sind."

The object thus set is commendable, and the manner in which it is accomplished praiseworthy. For the matter is well arranged, the statements brief yet clear, and the whole admirably *übersichtlich*. Here and there, to be sure, explanations are given which, to say the least, are doubtful. But that is to be expected of any book, and does not detract from its general value and usefulness. In some places more space might well have been given for more thorough discussion of the matter.

I note the following points in which a different explanation, a change of statement, or an addition may or should be made:

§ 181, c. It is not altogether certain that Skt. *ṛṇōmi* 'errege,' Gk. *oprv̄mi* are formed with a suffix *-neu-*. They are perhaps rather from a base *ereu-* with nasal infix, and related to Lat. *ruō*, Gk. *ῥοῶν* 'stürme los,' Skt. *ṛvā* 'runner,' etc. (cf. Hirt, *Idg. Abl.* 483). So also Lat. *struō*, Goth. *straujan*: Skt. *str̥nōti*, and others.—§ 183, b. Goth. *weiha* does not necessarily represent a pre-Germ. *\*wetko*, but may simply be a restoration of the normal type. This is certainly often the case in Goth. To ON. *vega* 'kämpfen, töten' add OE. *wegan* 'kill,' *ge-wegan* 'fight,' OHG. *wigant*, *ubar-wihit*, MHG. *wehen* 'kämpfen.' See also other examples of the restoration of the normal type, *Germ. Studies* II, 13 f. An example of this is probably Goth. *giman*, OHG. *queman*. In this case as in others the normal type may have originated in the inf., which was formed independently from the verb-stem. So certainly also Goth. *sitan* produced *sita*, whereas, in the other dialects, *\*sitjō* produced *\*sitjan* (cf. Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.* 286).—§ 186, c. Goth. *waldan* 'walten' is a very doubtful example for the suffix *-dho-* in view of the pret. ON. *olla*. On the other hand Goth. *haldan* is beyond question from a *-to-* suffix, as is plain from OHG. *halthan*, OSw. *halla*.

§ 196. 'Die sog. reduplizierten perfekta ohne reduplikation' are explained according to the old theory as coming from earlier reduplicated perfects. So ON., OE. *hēt* are supposed to be from Germ. *\*hēhait* on the assumption that intervocalic *h* fell out at an early period. But OE. *heht* shows rather that the stem vowel fell out first. Moreover *\*hehait*